

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP

DIRECT DIAL
(302) 651-3116
DIRECT FAX
(888) 329-9462
EMAIL ADDRESS
JDANDERS@SKADDEN.COM

ONE RODNEY SQUARE
P.O. BOX 636
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE 19899-0636
TEL: (302) 651-3000
FAX: (302) 651-3001
www.skadden.com

FIRM/AFFILIATE OFFICES

BOSTON
CHICAGO
HOUSTON
LOS ANGELES
NEW YORK
PALO ALTO
SAN FRANCISCO
WASHINGTON, D.C.
BEIJING
BRUSSELS
FRANKFURT
HONG KONG
LONDON
MOSCOW
MUNICH
PARIS
SINGAPORE
SYDNEY
TOKYO
TORONTO
VIENNA

January 17, 2007

VIA CM/ECF & HAND DELIVERY

The Honorable Gregory M. Sleet
U.S. District Court for the
District of Delaware
844 North King Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

RE: *Rohm and Haas Electronic Materials LLC v. Honeywell
International Inc.*, Case No. 06-297-GMS

Dear Judge Sleet:

We write on behalf of Honeywell International Inc. ("Honeywell") in connection with the above-captioned patent infringement litigation. Your Honor will recall that, on December 1, 2006, we submitted to the PTO requests for reexamination of both of the patents that the Plaintiff has asserted in this litigation -- U.S. Patent Nos. 6,472,128 B2 and 6,773,864 B1 (hereinafter the "'128 Patent" and "'864 Patent", respectively). We are writing now to apprise the Court of certain developments relating to the reexamination requests.

On Friday, January 12, 2007, we received a letter from the PTO stating that "reexamination preprocessing" for the '128 Patent was complete, and the reexamination request was transferred to the Group Art Unit for consideration. The letter also stated the official filing date for the '128 reexamination request was December 4, 2006, rather than December 1, the date on which we submitted the request. Accordingly, the PTO must decide whether to grant the '128 reexamination request by March 4, 2007, rather than March 1, as stated in Honeywell's opening brief in support of its motion to stay. *See* Op. Br. at 1.

In addition, on January 16, 2007, we received a notice from the PTO advising us that the '864 reexamination request was incomplete due to certain inadvertent technical defects which do not change the substance of the arguments set forth in the request. This notice was not sent to us earlier because the PTO mistakenly sent the notice to the wrong party. We intend to file a response correcting the technical defects identified by the PTO no later than Friday, January 19, 2007.

Under this timetable, we anticipate that the PTO will have until April 19, 2007 to decide whether to reexamine the '864 Patent, instead of the March 1 date we identified in our opening brief. We will keep the Court apprised of any changes to this anticipated schedule. We do not believe that these minor delays at the PTO should have any impact on Honeywell's motion to stay, which we continue to believe should be granted for the reasons set forth in Honeywell's briefs that were previously filed with the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jeremy D. Anderson

Jeremy D. Anderson (I.D. 4515)

cc: Rudolf E. Hutz, Esq.
Daniel C. Mulveny, Esq.